

REMARKS

[0001] Applicant's attorney respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-10 and 25-35 are presently pending. No claims are amended herein. Claims 11, 13-19 and 21-24 are canceled. Claims 25-35 are added as new.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0002] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0003] Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Allowable Subject Matter

[0004] Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1-10. These claims have not been amended herein, and therefore remain allowable.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 102 and § 103

[0005] The Examiner rejects claims 11, 13-15, 19 and 21 under § 102. In addition, the Examiner rejects claims 23-24 under § 103. These claims have been canceled herein and, as such, the specific arguments and positions put forth in the Office Action are not addressed.

[0006] Accordingly, Applicant's attorney respectfully requests that the § 102 and § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0007] The Examiner's rejections were based upon the following reference:

- **US Patent No. 6,219,397 to Park:** "*Park*" hereinafter, (issued April 17, 2001).

Rejections

Based upon *Park*

[0008] Although new claims 25-35 have not been examined yet, Applicant's attorney presents a brief argument as to why *Park* does not teach or suggest the elements of new claims 25-35.

Independent Claim 25

[0009] Applicant's attorney submits that *Park* does not teach or suggest this claim because it does not disclose all of the elements as recited in this claim. In specific, claim 25 recites a control circuit coupled to the phase-frequency detector and operable to generate a conditioning signal based on a modulation value and the feedback signal[.]”

[0010] For example, referring, e.g., to FIGS. 1a and 2 of the present application, a phase-locked loop (PLL) 100 includes a control circuit having a means 110 for generating a modulation value $x[n]$. The PLL 100 (through control logic 125) may then generate a phase-error value (represented by the correction value N_c) by calculating an incremental value corresponding to an incremental phase error. This incremental value may be calculated from the conversion factor (i.e., the adjusting value K and its modulus M) and the modulation value $x[n]$. The correction value N_c is then converted (through DAC 130) into the conditioning current I_c . Thus, as the I_c conditions the charge-pump current I_p , a resulting control signal I_{pc} is generated based on the phase-error signal and the conditioning signal.

[0011] The analogous components *Park* as contended the Examiner's line of argument in the most recent Office Action is flawed. The Examiner contends that the phase-frequency detector 120 of *Park* generates a phase-error value based on the phase difference between F1 and F2. However, the remaining analogy presented by the Examiner breaks down at this point as the Examiner contends that the phase-error value is also the conditioning signal that modifies the phase-error value. The phase-error value in *Park* cannot be both simultaneously. Thus, in this analogy, the generation of the phase-error value would have to be generated from itself. Consequently, *Park* does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant's attorney asks the Examiner to pass this claim to allowance.

Independent Claim 31

[0012] Applicant's attorney submits that *Park* does not teach or suggest this claim because it does not disclose all of the elements as recited in this claim. In specific, claim 31 recites generating a conditioning signal based upon a modulation value and the feedback signal; modifying the phase-error signal with the conditioning signal. That is, the second set of data is produced from the phase-error value. As discussed above, *Park* does not teach a conditioning signal separate and distinct from a phase-error signal.

Independent Claim 35

Applicant's attorney submits that this claim recites an electronic circuit having a phase-locked loop similar to the phase-locked loop of claim 25.

Conclusion

[0013] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant's attorney respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

[0014] Any additional fees required as a result of this amendment have been paid from the below-referenced deposit account as filed herewith. Should further payment be required to cover such fees you are hereby authorized to charge such payment to Deposit Account No. 07-1897.

Respectfully Submitted,

Graybeal, Jackson, LLP
Representatives for Applicant

/Kevin D. Jablonski/
Kevin D. Jablonski (kevin@graybeal.com)
Registration No. 50,401
USPTO Customer No.: 00996

Dated: December 11, 2008

Telephone: (425) 455-5575
Facsimile: (425) 455-1046